



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,593	09/16/2003	Michael A. Centanni	ST8012US	3283
22203	7590	02/14/2006		
KUSNER & JAFFE HIGHLAND PLACE SUITE 310 6151 WILSON MILLS ROAD HIGHLAND HEIGHTS, OH 44143			EXAMINER	MCKANE, ELIZABETH L
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1744	

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/663,593	CENTANNI ET AL.
	Examiner Leigh McKane	Art Unit 1744
<i>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
<b>THE REPLY FILED 27 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</b>		
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p><b>NOTICE OF APPEAL</b></p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>		
<p><b>AMENDMENTS</b></p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>		
<p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): <u>112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph</u>.</p>		
<p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>3-9, 16, 21 and 31</u> would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: <u>3-9, 16, 21 and 31</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 2, 11-14, 17-20 and 22-29</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>		
<p><b>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</b></p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>		
<p><b>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</b></p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See attachment</u>.</p>		
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____</p>		
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		
 Leigh McKane Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1744		

***Advisory Action***

1. The Examiner maintains the position set forth in the Final Rejection that May et al., either alone or in combination with Stemmle and Edwards et al., meets the claim limitations of the rejected claims. With respect to the sensor claims, May et al. discloses piezoelectric sensors having metal oxide coatings of the same reactive tetravalent metal claimed by Applicant (Mn), and thus they are at least *capable of* applicant's claimed catalytic reaction with hydrogen peroxide. Applicant has failed to show that the piezoelectric sensor of May et al. is not capable of a catalytic reaction with a sterilant gas, specifically hydrogen peroxide. A recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations, *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647.

2. As to the rejection of the method and system for detection of hydrogen peroxide using the piezoelectric sensor, the Examiner has provided motivation for the combination of May et al. with Stemmle and Edwards et al.. Moreover, although Applicant submits that May et al. provides no indication that the metal oxides would have been effective in detecting hydrogen peroxide through catalytic reaction, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. May et al. clearly teaches that Group VII hydrides can be effectively detected using oxides of metals, such as divalent ZnO. The skilled practitioner, through routine experimentation, would have determined the most appropriate metal oxide for the gas species being detected.

***Conclusion***

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leigh McKane whose telephone number is 571-272-1275. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (5:30 am-2:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Leigh McKane*  
**Leigh McKane**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1744**

elm  
8 February 2006